

2

Docket No. 6391-1-3
Serial No. 09/293,486

and accordingly that information was not able to be included on the face page of the Communication. Although the inventor is correctly identified on the Communication, an unfortunate clerical error resulted in an incorrect title being set forth. Applicant regrets the error, and any inconvenience resulting therefrom, but respectfully asserts that the filing of that April 15, 1999 Communication was a good faith attempt to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.607. To clarify, claims 1-22 of the subject application are identical to the entire set of claims which issued in the first U.S. patent disclosed in the Communication, U.S. Patent No. 5,664,725. Thus, claims 1-22 of this application are copied from claims 1-22 of the '725 patent. Claims 23-32 are substantially identical to claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent No. 5,746,450; the only difference being that each of claims 2-10 of the '450 patent depends from "claim 1," while claims 24-32 of the subject application depend from "claim 23." Finally, claims 33-40 are copied from claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 5,697,648. The claims are identical except for the fact that claims 2-8 of the '648 patent depend from "claim 1," while claims 34-40 of this application depend from "claim 33." Again, Applicant regrets any inconvenience caused by the mistitling of the Communication disclosing the U.S. patents from which the current claims were copied.

Next, at page 3 of the Office Letter, Applicant is required to explain why each of claims 2-32 and 34-40 corresponds to either of the proposed counts (pursuant to 37 CFR 1.607(a)(4)). Applicant attempted to provide the required explanation in his March 22, 2000 Request for Interference which was filed in response to the Miscellaneous Office Letter mailed January 18, 2000 in the subject application. Applicant respectfully asserts that the Request set forth the basis for asserting that claims 2-22 correspond to proposed count I, while claims 23-32 and 34-40 correspond to proposed count II. Specifically, Applicant provided an analysis of the language of each claim, noting that claims 2-22 contain substantially the same limitations as claim 1, but also contain additional limitations which were specified with respect to each claim. In this way, claim 1 is the broadest claim, with the remaining claims falling within the scope of claim 1. The additional limitations set forth in each of claims 2-22 are insufficient to render those claims patentably distinct from the subject matter of claim 1. Since Applicant believes that claims 2-22 are not patentably distinct from claim 1, which is identical to proposed count I, claims 2-22 are not patentably distinct from the subject matter of the count, and thus correspond to proposed count I.

3

Docket No. 6391-1-3
Serial No. 09/293,486

Similarly, claim 33 is identical to proposed count II. Applicant provided an analysis of the language of each of claims 23-32 and 34-40, noting that they contain substantially the same limitations as claim 33, but also contain additional limitations which were specified with respect to each claim. In this way, Applicant has shown that claim 33 is the broadest claim, with the remaining claims falling within the scope of claim 33 or at least not being patentably distinct from claim 33. The additional limitations set forth in each of claims 2-22 are insufficient to render those claims patentably distinct from the subject matter of claim 1. Since Applicant believes that claims 23-32 and 34-40 are not patentably distinct from claim 33, which is identical to proposed count II, claims 23-32 and 34-40 are not patentably distinct from the subject matter of the count, and thus correspond to proposed count II.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the foregoing fulfills the requirements of 37 CFR 1.607(a)(4), and requests reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing.

Applicant believes that all claims as currently pending are now in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees under 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17 as required by this paper to Deposit Account 19-0065.

Applicant invites the Examiner to call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any aspect of this response. It is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned to arrange a telephonic interview if, after entrance and consideration of this response, the Examiner is of the opinion that any grounds for objection or rejection remain.

Respectfully submitted,


Jeff Lloyd
Patent Attorney

Registration No. 35,589

Phone No.: 407-426-7500

Address : Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwanchik
A Professional Association
1000 Legion Place
Suite 1750
Orlando, FL 32801

JL/gm

Attachment: Petition and Fee for Extension of Time